Characteristics and Competencies for Teacher Educators: Addressing the Need for Improved Professional Standards in Turkey

Servet Celik
Karadeniz Technical University
Turkey

Abstract: Although a great deal of attention has been given to the nature of teaching and the qualities a good teacher ought to possess, there has been little emphasis on the specific characteristics and competencies that teacher educators should have. This paper discusses whether setting explicit standards for teacher educators would help or hinder efforts to improve the quality of teaching about teaching, touching on the viewpoints of student teachers versus professional organizations regarding standards of quality and exploring the implied and explicit standards of academic institutions for language teacher educators in the U.S. and Australia, in comparison with the less-defined standards currently present in the Turkish educational system.

Introduction

Significant research efforts in past decades have added a great deal to the body of knowledge about teaching and teachers. However, although the growing interest in trying to uncover the nature of teaching and teachers' work over the years has brought attention to teaching about teaching, teachers of teachers—who they are, what they do, what they think—and their desired characteristics, have often been ignored in studies of teacher education (Lanier & Little, 1986). Correspondingly, questions such as "What should teacher educators be competent in?" "What tasks and competencies are teacher educators expected to possess?" and ultimately "What does it mean to be a good teacher educator?" have rarely been investigated (Koster, Brekelmans, Korthagen, & Wubbels, 2005). Therefore, not surprisingly, very little has been discovered about the quality of teacher education, and hence, that of teacher educators, over the years (Buchberger & Byrne, 1995; Korthagen, 2000; Koster et al., 2005).

Teacher educators are defined as people "who provide instruction or who give guidance and support to student teachers, and who thus render a substantial contribution to the development of students into competent teachers" (Koster et al., 2005, p. 157). They are the ones who are responsible for the quality of teachers, and, therefore, that of education. Thus, it is of crucial importance that the questions above are addressed by exploring what contributes to the professional development of teacher educators and by explicitly setting the quality requirements and specific competencies for them. In this regard, the role of professional standards set or implied by academic publications, professional organizations, institutional guidelines for promotion and tenure, and other relevant sources should be highlighted, as standards are the main criteria by which performance and professional development of teacher educators can be assessed.

Standards: Good or bad?

The development of professional standards for teachers has been criticized over the years by several researchers; it is vital to disclose this criticism before the benefits of standards can be emphasized. A main point of criticism is the way standards are being developed (Zuzovsky & Libman, 2003). It can be claimed that teacher educators' rights are violated and they are not valued as professionals if people from outside the profession generate a list of standards and impose it on them. Therefore, as Smith (2003) advocates, this group should be given an important role in formulating the content of the profile and standards for their profession. Another criticism is that standards usually do not take the complexity and unpredictability of teaching and learning into account (i.e., Korthagen, 2004). Some authors also add that too much emphasis is placed on standards as sole assessment tools, and that normative systems lead toward deprofessionalization (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2001; Valli & Rennert-Ariev, 2002). Correspondingly, some question the validity, reliability, and practical feasibility of assessments of teacher educators based on competence descriptions (e.g., Zeichner, 2005). It is believed there is then little incentive for these professionals to reflect on their own norms and values, as they have to rely on external rules.

On the other hand, standards, if used properly, can provide guidelines for teacher educators themselves, for decision-makers, and for program designers, as well as serving as benchmarks for the assessment of teacher educators and their work. Standards are an invaluable resource for professional development. As Ingvarson (1998) states, "In a standards-based professional development system, standards provide a guide and a reference point to plan for personal professional development" (p. 136). Even many who criticize the establishment of standards support the value of a professional profile for this reason (see Zuzovsky & Libman, 2003). Therefore, standards should be used as guidelines for work within a specific context and allow for individual routes to professional competence and growth (Crooks, 2003). They should not, on the other hand, be aimed at creating an authoritarian assessment system (Ingvarson, 1998) that puts constraints on professional autonomy, inhibits professional creativity and development, and eventually erects a barrier to the quality of teacher educators and teacher education. Overall, standards serve as a blueprint for training and evaluation (Smith, 2005) and help establish a knowledge base that will make public the characteristics of teacher education for people from both in and outside of the profession.

What do professional organizations say?

Numerous distinguished teacher education organizations with decision-making power (i.e., accreditation or certification) have set standards applicable to teacher educators throughout the world.

The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) sets forth the Australian National Professional Standards for Teachers as endorsed by the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs. The National Professional Standards outline seven key elements for effective teacher educators (identified as "lead teachers"), which are summarized below:

Standard 1- Know the students and how they learn. Lead teachers are expected to select, develop, evaluate and revise teaching strategies "to improve student learning using knowledge of the physical, social and intellectual development and characteristics of students" in order to meet the needs of students from diverse cultural and economic backgrounds (AITSL, 2011).

Standard 2 – Know the content and how to teach it. Lead teachers must be able to "lead initiatives […] to evaluate and improve knowledge of content and teaching strategies," as well as to "monitor and evaluate the implementation of teaching strategies to expand learning opportunities and content knowledge for all students" (AITSL, 2011).

Standard 3 – Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning. Qualified lead teachers should "demonstrate exemplary practice and high expectations […] and lead colleagues to plan, implement and review the effectiveness of their learning and teaching programs" (AITSL, 2011).

Standard 4 – Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments. Lead teachers are expected to be active in "the development of productive and inclusive learning environments," as well as to "lead and implement behavior management initiatives" (AITSL, 2011) in order to ensure students' well-being.

Standard 5 – Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning. Lead teachers are required to "evaluate school assessment policies and strategies" to diagnose learning needs and to "co-ordinate student performance and program evaluation using internal and external student assessment data to improve teaching practice (AITSL, 2011).

Standard 6 – Engage in professional learning. Lead teachers should "initiate collaborative relationships to expand professional learning opportunities, engage in research, and provide quality opportunities and placements for pre-service teachers" (AITSL, 2011).

Standard 7 – Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community. Lead teachers are expected to "model exemplary ethical behavior and exercise informed judgments in all professional dealings with students, colleagues and the community," as well as taking a "leadership role in professional and community networks and support[ing] the involvement of colleagues in external learning opportunities" (AITSL, 2011).

In the United States, several professional organizations – the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) – have defined requirements for teacher education faculty as set forth in Table 1 below.

ATE	NCATE	TEAC
Model the knowledge, skills, and attitudes reflecting the best available practices in teacher education.	Qualified faculty with earned doctorates or exceptional expertise; contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise.	Faculty accept the Inquiry Brief and that the preparation of competent, caring and qualified educators is their own goal for the program.
Research and contribute to one or more areas of scholarly activity that are related to teaching, learning, and/or teacher education.	Model best professional practices in teaching: Reflective or conceptual framework, incorporate appropriate performance assessments.	Faculty accept the Inquiry Brief as demonstration of accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program.
Inquire systematically into, and reflect on, their own practice and demonstrate commitment to lifelong professional development.	Model best professional practices in scholarship.	Faculty are qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned;
Provide leadership in developing, implementing, and evaluating programs for educating teachers that embrace diversity, and are rigorous, relevant, and grounded in accepted theory, research, and best practice.	Model best professional practices in service.	Faculty qualifications are equal to or better than the statistics for the institution as a whole with regard to the attributes of the members of the faculty
Collaborate regularly and in significant ways with representatives of schools, universities, state education agencies, professional associations and communities to improve teaching, learning and teacher education.	Collaborate in community of learners.	
Serve as informed, constructively critical advocates for high-quality education, public understanding of educational issues, and excellence and diversity in teaching and	Unit evaluates professional education faculty performance.	

teacher education.		
Contribute to improving teacher education.	Unit facilitates professional development, mentoring new faculty, supports scholarly work.	

Table 1: Requirements for Teacher Educators in the United States

It is interesting to note that neither the ATE nor the TEAC standards explicitly state what formal requirements, in terms of degrees, certificates and diplomas, are required of teacher educators. The reason is likely due to the assumption that all those who teach in schools and colleges of education have doctorates or are in the process of getting one, or as Murray (2001) states, the reason might be that there is little consensus about what the explicit standards for teacher educators should be (i.e., whether faculty in teacher education institutions should all be qualified teachers with a teaching license or whether they all need to have experience in teaching children in school). There seems to be extremely little written or implied information provided regarding such external standards. The standards endorsed by all three of the organizations mentioned above focus mainly on more implicit aspects of teacher educators' work-related to behavior, much of which can only be self-documented by the teacher educators themselves (Smith, 2005).

In order to ensure that the quality of teacher education is universally consistent, Smith (2005) asserts that it is crucial that this implicit body of knowledge be made explicit by teacher educators. With teaching standards based largely on explicit factors, it would become fairly simple to assess teacher educators; documentation of the extent to which explicit standards are met is straightforward through the analysis of a number of documents, such as curriculum vitae, diplomas, certificates and letters of recommendation.

Why Turkey Lacks Similar Professional Standards for Teachers

In Turkey, professional associations with authoritative power similar to ATE, NCATE and TEAC are not present, due to the inclusive control of education by the government. There are two official bodies that are authorized to make decisions regarding standards and certification of faculty: the Ministry of National Education and the Higher Education Council. Disappointingly, neither the seemingly exhaustive list of "Standards and Accreditation in Teacher Education in Turkey" (n.d.) compiled by the Higher Education Council, nor the certification and accreditation information presented by the Ministry of National Education refers to the standards and the expected qualities for teacher educators; while they extensively discuss "Teacher Competencies," (n.d.) the qualities specifically expected of teacher educators are ignored.

What does the literature say?
Functions of teacher educators

Standards within a profession are often associated with the necessary functions of individuals within that profession. Koster, Korthagen, Wubbels & Hoornweg (1996) discusses several general functions that teacher educators fulfill.

1. Facilitators of the learning process for student teachers: Effective teacher educators play a major role in facilitating and supporting the reflective learning process student teachers develop (see, Richards & Lockhart, 1994). This, however, needs be accomplished by sharing not only their theoretical knowledge, but also by putting this knowledge into their own practice, in other words, by "making tacit knowledge explicit" (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999, p. 31).

2. Developers of new knowledge and curricula: Teacher educators are expected to create new knowledge, consisting of practical knowledge in the form of new curricula and learning programs for teacher education and schools, as well as theoretical knowledge generated from research.

3. Assessors and Gatekeepers: Another key function of teacher educators is assessment; both formative assessment enhancing learning, as well as summative assessment that requires teacher educators to act as gate-keepers and decide who has the necessary training and skills to become a teacher. In this sense, teacher educators not only provide support to candidates seeking enter the profession, but also act as their judges before they can do so, a dual role some have found to be problematic (e.g., Wilson, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 2001).

4. Collaborators and team members: Efficient teacher educators are collaborators with members of the university and other higher educational institutions and decision-makers (Koster, Korthagen, & Wubbels, 1998), as well as with teachers and school administrators where teacher candidates' student-teaching takes place. As discussed by Nunan (1992), collaboration is an important component of language learning and teaching. Thus, it is essential that teacher educators help student teachers to develop the skill of being good team members through involvement with the respective contexts they serve (university and school); by promoting partnership in their relationships with others (i.e., with student teachers, or other faculty); and by encouraging student teachers to take part in joint efforts such as group-work and research projects.

All of the above-mentioned tasks are interconnected with the principles and values in teacher education, and thus, are consistent with the standards for teacher educators, as standards describe a requested level of professionalism, translated into actions and performances. Standards entertain several aspects that make up what some refer to as the expertise (professional knowledge and competence) of teacher educators (e.g., Smith, 2005).

Required expertise for teacher educators

The elements which comprise the expertise of teachers have been the topic of several recently published studies in the field of teacher education. Most studies seem to

agree that teachers' expertise relates to subject matter knowledge and knowing how to transfer this to others (didactical knowledge); awareness of how individuals learn, feel and develop (pedagogical knowledge); and learned understanding of socio-cultural/institutional context; and demonstrating organizational competence (Fish, 1995; Day, 1999). Despite the focus on a knowledge base for teachers, little attention has been given to the expertise of teacher educators (Smith, 2005). Nonetheless, with the growing consciousness of teacher educators as professionals, driven by research performed by teacher educators as stakeholders themselves (Munby, Russell, & Martin, 2001), teacher educators' expertise—what they need to know and be able to do (Ingvarson, 1998, p. 128)—has become an important area of inquiry in developing standards, and ultimately, in assessing and improving teacher educators' performance, effectiveness and growth in the field.

Teacher educators' expertise is diverse and complex in nature; yet there is a popular assumption that a good teacher will automatically make a good teacher educator. Smith (2003) examines this issue by discussing some of the literature on the subject, and by asking novice teachers and teacher educators about their perceptions of the characteristics of good teacher educators, the professional knowledge of teacher educators and the difference between the expertise of teacher educators and classroom teachers. Findings indicated that even though there is much overlap, there are also distinct differences in the expertise of the two groups of professionals in the following areas:

- Articulation of reflectivity and meta-cognition;
- Quality of knowledge;
- Knowledge of how to create new knowledge;
- Teaching children vs. teaching adults;
- Comprehensive understanding of the educational system;
- Professional maturity and autonomy.

According to Smith (2005), unlike teachers, who are mainly required to be good practitioners, teacher educators are expected to be self-aware and to reflect and articulate tacit knowledge of teaching and make it available to teachers-to-be, thus bridging theory and practice. Teacher educators' professional knowledge is expected to be more comprehensive, rich and extensive, both in terms of the specific subject matter taught and in relation to areas such as didactics, pedagogy and psychology. Teacher educators should engage in curriculum development and research, which is viewed as an indispensable part of their professional development. Unlike teachers, they are expected to be skillful in teaching learners of all age groups and to present a high level of professional maturity and autonomy. Finally, they are to have a comprehensive understanding of the educational system that goes beyond their own personal teaching context.

Teachers are the first-hand witnesses of teacher educators' work and practice. Therefore, an important aspect of looking at standards, in addition to the above-mentioned idea of giving the teacher educators themselves an important role in formulating the content of standards, is finding out what qualities teachers think teacher educators should possess. In eliciting answers to what it means to be a good language teacher educator, Smith (2005) found differences between the views of novice teachers and teacher educators, despite a general agreement on the statement that good teacher

educators provide support and show patience and empathy to student teachers for the sake of their growth. For instance, from the perspective of new teachers who have had access to a wide array of teacher educators, a gap between theory and practice exists, and thus, they feel that it is important for good teacher educators to "practice what they preach" (p. 185). A similar attribution to modeling can be seen in the ATE standards urging teacher educators "to model professional teaching practices" (ATE, 2006, standard 1).

Another main point noted by novice teachers which was not mentioned by teacher educators in Smith's (2005) study was the need for teacher educators to teach meta-cognitively and to articulate their tacit knowledge of teaching, explaining the whys and hows of their actions and in-action decision making. Ethell and McMeriman (2000), confirming this view, affirmed that the articulation of the thinking of expert teachers facilitates the understanding of theoretical and practical components of teacher education. In addition, most teachers referred to school experience and the desire to work with teacher educators who had recent experience as school teachers. These teachers questioned the credibility of the guidance of teacher educators who lack knowledge of today's schools and students; they believed that effective teacher educators should be knowledgeable about the current educational system. Murray (2001) points out a similar issue, that of whether all teacher educators must be qualified teachers with experience in teaching in schools, as one of the matters on which there is no professional consensus. Finally, unlike teacher educators, almost half of the novice teachers in the study believed that good teacher educators are also good managers of time and people.

According to Smith (2005), teacher educators, in contrast, ranked "enhancement of reflection in trainees" as the most prominent feature of good teacher educators. They also mentioned self-awareness and being involved in ongoing professional development as characteristics of good teacher educators, supporting the view of professional growth based on reflective practice represented in the Association of Teacher Educators (2006) list of standards. Half of teacher educators listed research as an important part of their professional activities, whereas novice teachers mainly brought up the quality of teaching of teacher educators in their responses. Research is also highlighted as an important requirement in the criteria for tenure and promotion, both by teacher educators and in the ATE standards. Nevertheless, some experts believe that there is not necessarily a correlation between research and effective teaching (Marsh & Hattie, 2002). Further characteristics of good teacher educators listed by teacher educators and not by novice teachers are related to ethical aspects of the profession, such as acting upon one's beliefs and believing in education as a worthwhile and rewarding enterprise; collegial aspects, such as focusing on teamwork and supporting colleagues; and personal characteristics, such as being assertive and confident regarding work and professional development.

In another study dealing with the quality requirements needed for teacher educators, Koster et al. (2005) explored what teacher educators themselves consider to be the main quality requirements, as well as vital tasks and competencies. They made a distinction between the tasks teacher educators have to carry out and the competencies they should possess as components of a professional profile, and tried to identify these categories based on both a literature search and several rounds of interviews with fellow teacher educators. Based on average scores, three task areas were determined to be necessary for every individual teacher educator: the teacher educator working on his/her

own development and that of colleagues (professionalism and well-being); providing a teacher education program (i.e., teaching, assessing, counseling); and taking part in policy development and development of teacher education. "Organizing activities for and with teachers" and "selecting future teachers" were considered necessary to some extent.

Although "carrying out research" was not always considered significant for individual teacher educators, the reason was tied to the different views of university-based and non-university-based teacher educators regarding research. The study also asked what teacher educators thought were the important elements in a competence profile. Content competencies (i.e., being able to discuss one's professional field with others) and communicative and reflective competencies (i.e., being able to evaluate one's own teaching and make changes accordingly) fell into the category of "very necessary," whereas organizational competencies (i.e., being able to work in a team) and pedagogical competencies (i.e., being able to make one's own pedagogical approach accessible to student teachers) were established to be "necessary." Koster et al. mentioned that their study focused on knowledge and skills, and not on the attitudes, motives and personal characteristics of teacher educators, as they believed such elusive aspects are already reflected in tangible aspects such as skills.

Successfully performing the tasks described here is not a straightforward process. It requires that teacher educators deal with a complex dual role (Ducharme, 1993) of not only teaching student teachers, but also practicing what they preach through modeling. In this regard, a major aspect of teacher educators' expertise is the ability to make professional knowledge and competence about teaching and learning explicit (Smith, 2003)—in other words, to "explicitly model for their students, the thoughts and actions that underpin one's pedagogical approach" (Loughran & Berry, 2005). Therefore, rather than putting too much emphasis on explicit aspects of teaching and on conceptual/expert knowledge, it is vital that teacher educators are able to articulate the tacit aspects of teaching and explain these to student teachers in order to develop their perceptual knowledge. This, however, requires that teacher educators are aware that recognizing what informs their teaching about teaching is just as important as how they teach, as these two elements operate together in offering opportunities for constructive practice and professional development. In this regard, one of the qualities of an effective teacher educator is the ability to help student teachers explore and build on their perceptions by providing the opportunity to reflect systematically on the details of their practical experiences (Korthagen et al., 2001, p. 29). This is particularly important in preparing teachers for very likely cases where theory will fail to respond to their practical concerns.

Similarly, Loughran and Berry (2005) discuss the significance of explicit modeling in teacher education. They believe that teacher educators should depart from the traditional role of transferring information and practice explicit modeling that operates concurrently at two levels: on one level, it is about teacher educators doing in their practice what they expect their students to do in their teaching. On another, it is about teacher educators offering teacher candidates the opportunity to be familiar with the pedagogical reasoning, feelings, values, and actions that accompany their practice across a range of teaching and learning experiences. Thus, teacher educators should create a balance between delivering essential knowledge and creating opportunities for student teachers to make knowledge meaningful through practical wisdom.

However, as Loughran and Berry (2005) affirm, making their expertise explicit and accessible to others through articulation of knowledge of practice is a difficult and complex task for teacher educators which demands considerable awareness and knowledge of 'self,' pedagogy and students. Loughran and Berry (2005) mention a variety of techniques teacher educators can use to make their non-cognitive knowledge accessible to their students:

- Carrying out think-alouds;
- Journaling;
- Discussions during and after class both in groups and with individual student teachers;
- Questioning;
- Probing and inquiring through pedagogic interventions during teaching;
- Debriefing of their shared teaching and learning experiences.

They consider that "the ability to be explicit about what one is doing and why, is enhanced through systematically inquiring into learning through experience (self-study) so that the relationship between knowing and doing might be more accessible" (p. 194). However, as Cochran-Smith (2005) argues, knowledge of public theory should be part of teacher educators' expertise, and thus, personal theories developed by self-studies should be linked to public theory for the sake of developing a functioning knowledge-base for teacher education and advancing the status of teacher educators in academia.

Facets of modeling good teaching mentioned above highlights the importance of professional critique, another key quality in teacher education that involves constructive analysis of teacher educators' teaching and self-learning, as well as their students' learning and student-teaching. Therefore, effective teacher educators work toward the development of both themselves and their students by inquiring systematically into practice, by being committed to lifelong professional development, by highlighting particular instances in student teachers' teaching, and by challenging even their expert status at times to share their own pedagogical thoughts and actions for critique, and thus, to make it possible for student-teachers to " 'see into practice'—all practice, not just the 'good things we do' " (Loughran & Berry, 2005, p. 200).

Besides providing support to students, effective teacher educators are also in service of their profession and its development through leadership and scholarly work. Teacher educators serve in professional organizations and provide leadership at the local, state, national, and international levels in developing, implementing, and evaluating theory and practice for high-quality education. Moreover, teacher educators contribute to the field by carrying out and publishing research, systematically integrating the knowledge from research into their pedagogical repertoire and applying it to new contexts. As Cochran-Smith (2005) demonstrates, successful teacher educators are not just "smart consumers of research," (p. 224) but they also conduct research in relation to their own professional experiences and programs.

Turkey's case

In Turkey, unlike in other Western countries, the qualifications and responsibilities of faculty members, including teacher educators, are strictly determined

by law; neither educational intuitions nor professional organizations have any input or the authority to make changes to this law. Article 22 in Part Five of *the Law of Higher Education* (n.d.) lists the following requirements for all faculty, notwithstanding their institutions, fields and programs:

1. To carry out and have carried out education and practical studies at the pre-baccalaureate, baccalaureate and post-graduate (post-baccalaureate) levels in the institutions of higher education in line with the purpose and objectives of this law, and to direct project preparations and seminars;
2. To undertake scientific and scholarly research for publication in the institutions of higher education;
3. In accordance with a program arraged by the head of the related unit, to set aside certain days for the advising and guidance of students, helping them as needed and directing them in line with the aims and basic principles of this law;
4. To carry out the duties assigned by authorized organs;
5. To perform other duties assigned by this law.

The same law settles on the nationwide promotion and tenure criteria for universities. Article number 23 lists the following prerequisites for the appointment of Assistant Professors:

> To have acquired a doctorate, or specialist status in medicine, or proficiency in certain branches of the fine arts to be determined by the Council of Higher Education upon the recommendation of the Inter-university Board; 2) To pass the foreign language examination (The Law of Higher Education, n.d.).

Article number 26 of the same law establishes the requirements for promotion to professorship:

> To have worked in the relevant field of study for five years after receiving the title of Associate Professor; 2) To have done work of practical application and to have published original research of an international standard; and 3) To have been appointed to a staff position of professorship (The Law of Higher Education, n.d.).

> Hiring for faculty positions at Turkish public universities is centralized and carried out by the Higher Education Council based on nation- and institution-wide regulations. It is clear that both the responsibilities required of academic faculty in Turkey and the criteria for tenure and promotion in Turkish universities as defined by law are vague and leave a great deal open to interpretation, and thus, need to be reformed. A comprehensive and unambiguous list of clear standards, fine-tuned for the various disciplines, will grant a truer vision for the future of education in the nation.

Summary

Research in Turkey concerning standards for teacher educators, compared to the United States and Australia, is scarce. In addition, due to the centralized administration and ruling of Turkish universities by the Higher Education Council, it is not feasible for universities or organizations to design external standards for hiring, evaluating, promoting, rewarding or improving teacher educators; the Higher Education Council's

standards for teacher education focus mainly on teacher candidates, with no specific mention of teacher educators. Nationwide requirements for promotion and tenure for all academicians, regardless of their field, do not go beyond limited expression of a few general statements. In addition, criteria for promotion and tenure, focusing largely on the quality of teacher educators' research and the quantity of their publications, coupled with the rigid political and economic contexts of universities, carry the risk of causing them to overlook the inner features and obligations of their profession.

Furthermore, with millions of students and an extreme shortage of teachers at all levels, it is not surprising that the emphasis on teacher education has shifted away from raising standards for teacher education programs in favor of training greater numbers of teachers in as quickly as possible. The unintentional effect is a decreased demand for well-organized teacher education programs and reduced expectations of teacher educators, just for the sake of a temporary solution, ignoring the foundations of teacher education and hoping that teachers will learn and improve as they teach.

Despite the major differences in the contexts and organization of teacher education, the partial inference of standards in Turkey seems to coincide with international standards, chiefly because academic goals and objectives in Turkey are generally a reflection or reproduction of the standards set or implied by well-developed countries with extensive research, such as the United States, Australia, and certain European nations. These comparable standards for teacher educators are as follows:

1. Being a good teacher, which is often taken for granted, and which includes countless characteristics: from efficient organization of courses to successfully teaching them; from fair and constructive assessment to modeling the best behaviors both for a teacher and for a human being. The quality of teaching requires having a strong pedagogical foundation including expert knowledge of the field and of education in general, instructional skills of transferring this knowledge to others, and as Loughran and Berry (2003) emphasize, the ability to articulate the tacit knowledge of teaching and to bring practical experiences to a theoretical level.

2. Engaging in creating new knowledge of a practical (learning materials, curricula) and theoretical (research, publication in professional journals) nature, a key component of what ATE (2006) refers to as "*systematic inquiry*." Publication and research are particularly important for academic endorsements of all kinds (i.e., hiring, promotion) and seem to be viewed as an inherent component of teacher educators' responsibilities both in Turkey and abroad.

3. Offering quality support to pre-service and in-service teachers, and trying to make an impact on the students, program, institution, field, and education; by actively seeking to take on leadership roles; and by practicing teamwork and collaboration, as advocated by research, the Australian National Professional Standards for Teachers, and the standards set forth by the ATE. Correspondingly, good teacher educators are not only in the service of their institutions, but are also expected to serve the entire educational community by providing counseling, by introducing teaching methods and programs to schools for staff development, and by actively participating in committees for policy-making.

4. Taking part in an ongoing personal professional development, referred to as *inquiring and reflecting into one's practice* by ATE (2006), in addition to

assisting with the professional development of others (i.e., student-teachers, colleagues, school administrators). It is clear, after reviewing a combination of sources that shed light on standards for teacher educators, that professional development and standards are intertwined. That is, professional, as well as personal, growth and development is both a standard itself and an outcome after other standards are accomplished.

In conclusion, the nature of teaching about teaching demands skills, expertise and knowledge that should not be taken for granted. Thus, research highlighting issues regarding standards for teacher educators is needed and should be encouraged, so that such skills, expertise and knowledge can be cautiously investigated and articulated. Furthermore, by doing so, professional development opportunities for teacher educators will arise and their impact within the profession will advance.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1999). *Comparison of NCATE and TEAC processes for accreditation of teacher education.* Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.gacte.net/documents/NCATE-TEAC_Chart.doc

Australian Institute for Training and School Leadership. (2011). *National Professional Standards for Teachers.* Retrieved March 25, 2011, from: http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/_resources/AITSL_National_Professional_Standards_for_Teachers.pdf

Applying to Teach at Isik. (n.d.) Retrieved June 20, 2005, from: http://www.efl.isikun.edu.tr/efl/apply.htm

Association of Teacher Educators. (2006). *Standards for teacher educators.* Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.ate1.org/pubs/Standards_for_Teac.cfm

Buchberger, F., & Byrne, K. (1995). Quality in teacher education a suppressed theme?. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 18*(1), 9-23.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Higher standards for prospective teachers: What's missing from the discourse? *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(3), 179-181.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Teacher educators as researchers: Multiple perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 219-225.

Crooks, T. (2003, April). *Some criteria for intelligent accountability applied to accountability in New Zealand.* Paper presented at the 2003 annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved May 12, 2006, from http://www.fairtest.org/k12/AERA_Paper.html

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers the challenges of lifelong learning.* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer.

Ducharme, E. R. (1993). *The lives of teacher educators.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ethell, R., & McMeriman, M. (2000). Unlocking the knowledge in action of an expert practitioner. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(2), 87-101.

Fish, D. (1995). *Quality learning for student practice university tutors' educational practice.* London: David Fulton Publishers.

Ingvarson, L. (1998). Professional development as the pursuit of professional standards: The standard-based professional development system. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14(1), 127-140.

Indiana University Academic Handbook. (2001, August). Retrieved December 15, 2006, from http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/acad_handbk_2001.pdf

Indiana University, School of Education 2002 Promotion and Tenure Criteria. (2002). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/2002protencriteria.html

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2000). Teacher educators: From neglected group to spearhead in the development of education. In G. M. Willems, J. H. J. Stakenborg, & W. Veuglers (Eds.), Trends in Dutch teacher education (pp. 35-48). Leuven: Garant.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 20(1), 77-97.

Korthagen, F. A. J., & Kessels, J. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. Educational Researcher, 28(4), 4-17.

Korthagen, F.A.J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Koster, B., Brekelmans, M., Korthagen, F. A. J., & Wubbels, T. (2005). Quality requirements for teacher educators. Teaching and Teacher Education, 21(2), 157-176.

Koster, B., Korthagen, F. A. J., & Wubbels, T. (1998). Is there anything left for us? Functions of cooperating teachers and teacher educators. European Journal of Teacher Education, 21(1), 75-89.

Koster, B., Korthagen, F. A. J., Wubbels, T., & Hoornweg, J. (1996). Roles, competencies and training of teacher educators, a new challenge. In E. Befring (Ed.), Teacher education for equality (pp. 397-411). Oslo: Oslo College.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Language Education Department: Jobs. (n.d.). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.indiana.edu/~langed/scholar/job.html

Loughran, J., & Berry, A. (2005). Modeling by teacher educators. Teaching and Teacher Education, 21(2), 193-203.

Marsh, H., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. The Journal of Higher Education, 73(5), 603-641.

Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin, A. (2001). Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. In V. Richardson (Ed), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 877-904). Washington, DC: AERA.

Murray, F. (2001). The overreliance of accreditors on consensus standards. Journal of Teacher Education, 52(2), 211-222.

Nunan, D. (1992). Collaborative language learning and teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (1994). Reflective teaching in second language classrooms. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, K. (2003, April). *Teacher educators' professional knowledge; how does it differ from teachers' professional knowledge*. Paper presented at the *annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association conference*, Chicago, IL.

Smith, K. (2005). Teacher educators' expertise: what do novice teachers and teacher educators say? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 177-192.

Standards and Accreditation in Teacher Education in Turkey. (n.d.). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.yok.gov.tr/english/acr2/contents.html

Teacher Competencies. (n.d.). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.yok.gov.tr/webeng/acr2/a3/a3.html

The Law of Higher Education (n.d.). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.yok.gov.tr/english/law/content.html

Valli, L., & Rennert-Ariev, P. (2002). New standards and assessment? Curriculum transformation in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 34*(2), 201-225.

Wilson, S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (2001). Connecticut's story: A model for state teaching policy. *Teaching Quality Policy Briefs, 4*, 1–8. Available online at: http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Brief_four.pdf

Zeichner, K. (2005). Learning from experience with performance-based teacher education. In F. Peterman (Ed.), Designing performance assessment systems for urban teacher preparation (pp. 1-19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zuzovsky, R., & Libman, Z. (2003, August). *Standards of teaching and teaching tests: is this the right way to go?* Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction Conference, Padova, Italy.